

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 10, 2008 has been carefully considered.
Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Granstam et al. (U.S. pat. no. 6,587,691) in view of Fukumoto et al. (U.S. pat. no. 7,221,961).
Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1, taken as an example, recites, *inter alia*, a computer operably connected to a network and having software allowing for the production of status check requests to be sent to multiple modem units of portable devices. The modem units are configured to reply with modem status information, without being controlled by the host processor in the portable device.

These features of Claim 1, which are similarly presented in the other independent claims, are not disclosed in either Granstam or Fukumoto. While the system of Granstam is configured to track status information, including locations, of various mobile stations 17, Granstam does not disclose transmission of status check requests from a computer, and of modem status information from modem units in response. Nor does Granstam disclose absence of control by a host processor, so that modem units associated with different types of host processors can be tracked.

The Office Action points to column 3, line 3, 11-15, 42-45; column 7, lines 15-18, 35-42 (Office Action, p. 2, ll. 14-15) of Granstam to address the feature of status check requests from the computer. However, while these passages are concerned with status information of the mobile stations 17, they do not involve transmission of status check requests from a computer to mobile stations, as Applicants' claims expressly recite. Similarly, neither these passages nor column 7, line 27; column 8, lines 39-41; figure 5 (Office Action, p. 2, ll. 19-20) involve transmission of modem status information from modem units in response to status check requests from a computer, despite the allegation to the contrary in the Office Action. Finally, the passages (col. 1, lines 10-27; col. 6, lines 14-16; col. 3, lines 25-44; column 46, lines 60-63) in Fukomoto to which the Office Action points (Office Action, p. 4, ll. 7-8) to remedy Granstam's failure to

disclose absence of control by a host processor in fact do not relate to such absence of control at all, or to transmission of status information to a computer in response to status check requests from the computer. These claimed features therefore remain unaddressed by the cited references and the Office Action.

For these reasons at least, the combination of Granstam and Fukumoto, even if proper, which Applicants do not concede, fail to teach or suggest the presently claimed invention, and the obviousness rejection of claims 1-26 based on these references should be withdrawn.

Conclusion


In view of the preceding discussion, Applicants respectfully urge that the claims of the present application define patentable subject matter and should be passed to allowance.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone call would help advance prosecution of the present invention, the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number below.

Please charge any additional required fees, including those necessary to obtain extensions of time to render timely the filing of the instant Amendment and/or Reply to Office Action, or credit any overpayment not otherwise credited, to our deposit account no. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

Dated: April 9, 2008


Khaled Shami
Reg. No. 38,745

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040